

DISCUSSION

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy the interview in which we discussed the claim amendments that are being submitted herewith. As indicated in the Interview Summary, these amendments should overcome the Komarek reference.

Specifically, claim 1 and claim 10 were both amended to indicate that the continuous cut completely separates the sheets and forms two totally separate sheets of membrane and the two separate sheets are subsequently rolled up. These same limitations are also in new claim 12, which also indicates that the substrate on which the seam tape is applied consists essentially of a polymeric membrane adapted for use as a roofing membrane. Applicant has used the "consisting essentially of" language to further distinguish over the corrugated material disclosed in Komarek.

As discussed in the interview, the Komarek reference discloses a method of scoring partially through a corrugated material such as cardboard. It does not cut completely through the substrate. But it does cut through the outer layer of the corrugated (layer 14 in the drawings).

By these amendments, applicants are indicating that two totally and separate sheets of material are formed and these are subsequently rolled up. There obviously is no disclosure of rolling the two separate sheets in the Komarek reference since this is corrugated and it would not be rolled up. Further, it would not be rolled up as two separate

sheets because the disclosed process is not intended to cut through the corrugated to form two totally separate sheets. The process cuts through only one layer of the corrugated. Thus, claims 1, 10 and 12 distinguish over the Komarek reference.

It would be maintained that it would be unobvious to modify the Komarek reference to arrive at applicants' invention. One would never roll up corrugated. Accordingly, such modification would be unobvious.

Further, the Komarek reference is concerned with folding corrugated panels. The concurrent application of the adhesive tape with the cutting is more to facilitate application rather than to precisely align the adhesive tape. On the other hand, applicants' method steps of applying a double wide thickness of the seam tape to the center of a substrate and then cutting the substrate and the seam tape at the same time to form two separate sheets is intended to properly align the edge of the tape with the edge of the membrane. This concern is not expressed in the Komarek reference. Thus, these are reasons why one would not modify the Komarek reference to arrive at applicants' invention. Further, there is nothing that would motivate one to modify the disclosure in Komarek to arrive at applicants' invention.

Accordingly, in light of the above amendments, applicants would request reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of same.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

Application Serial No. 10/766,541
Amendment Dated July 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2006

By 

Gregory J. Lunn, Reg. No. 29,945

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 - Telephone
(513) 421-7269 - Facsimile